REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 27, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and allowed claims 12-23. Applicants thank Examiner Morrow for the indication of allowable subject matter. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes, Applicants have amended claims 12 and 20 and have added claim 24. Applicants note that at least claims 12 and 20 have merely been amended to remedy formalities and/or to add clarity to the meaning of these claims. Applicants believe that the amendments to at least claims 12 and 20 do not effect the breadth of those claims and should not change the scope of coverage of those claims. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Office Action suggested that, in claim 1, the phrases "the roof bow panel" and "the outer roof panel" lack antecedent basis. Those terms have been replaced such that proper antecedent basis is now provided.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 as being anticipated by Chang et al. The Office Action does not indicate the patent number of Chang et al, however, Applicants believe that the Office Action is referring to U.S. Patent No. 5,931,474. Applicants have amended claim 1 by adding additional language to the claim. Applicants believe that the additional language in combination with the other language represents patentable subject matter.

III. New Claims

Applicants have added claim 24 to the application to address an aspect of the present invention.

By amending the application, the Applicants do not concede that the patent coverage available to them would not extend as far as the original claim. Rather,

Applicants intend to file a continuation application to pursue the breadth of the claims as filed. Applicants believe that the Examiner has not made a sufficient showing of inherency of the teachings of the asserted prior art, especially given the lack of teachings in the cited references of the properties that Applicants have recited in their claims.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Dated: 8 Jecember, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Scott A. Chapple

Registration No. 46,287

DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC

29 W. Lawrence Street

Suite 210

Pontiac, MI 48342 (248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215